

REMARKS

Claims 6-9, 11, 12, and 24-46 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 6-9, 11, 12, 24-26, 33-37, 44, and 45 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 27-32, 38-43, and 46 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 27 and 41 were amended. Accordingly, claims 6-9, 11, 12, and 24-46 remain at issue. Applicants reserve the right to include the withdrawn claims in the present application should a linking claim be allowed.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 27, 28, 38-41, 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0168662) in view of *Kikkawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,032). Claims 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 20020018162). Claims 30, 32, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Nakagawa* in view of *Suzuki et al.* and *Nishida et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,168). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended independent claims 27 and 41 to recite that the first optical compensation layer and the second optical compensation layer are formed in a flat plate-like shape. This feature of the claimed invention is described in the specification and figures of the present application, see, e.g., page 8, lines 5-6, and is not disclosed or suggested in the references cited.

In particular, *Nakagawa* is directed to a liquid crystal projector to display an image on a liquid crystal device. The precise shape of the layers that the Examiner asserts are the optical compensation layers are not described in the specification of *Nakagawa*, and the cross section

drawing of Fig. 7 does not adequately depict that the layers are formed in a flat plate-like shape, as recited in amended claims 27 and 41. Similarly, the other references cited (*Kikkawa*, *Suzuki*, *Nishida*) do not disclose or suggest the optical compensation layers, as claimed, formed in a flat plate-like shape.

Therefore, the references cited, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 27 and 41, and Applicants respectfully request that these rejection be withdrawn. Claims 28-32 and 38- 40 depend from claim 27. Claims 42, 43, and 46 depend from claim 41. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 27-32, 38-43, and 46 are allowable over the cited art.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 17, 2007

By: David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000